



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,384	03/12/2004	Chin-Wen Chou	2450-0651PUS1	6025
2292	7590	07/11/2006	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			HOFFBERG, ROBERT JOSEPH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/798,384

Applicant(s)

CHOU, CHIN-WEN

Examiner

Robert J. Hoffberg

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Detailed Action***

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Regarding applicant's arguments that the molds have a non-circular horizontal cross section. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The upper mold #14 has a circular internal cross section that mates with the outer circular cross section of the fastening section #13. The lower mold #17 does not mate with fixing zone #20 and does not enter into the fastening zone during installation of the silver wire #16. The only definition to the shape of the lower mold as shown in Fig. 4A is that it is the same size as the major diameter of the fixing zone. It is examiner's understanding of claims 1-6, that the mold of claim 1 is used with the silver contact connection structure and since the upper mold contacts fastening section, the mold has a horizontal cross section matching the fastening section.
3. Examiner's objections to the specification and drawings are withdrawn based upon amended specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor (GB 2,257,832 A).

With respect to Claim 7, Taylor teaches a silver contact connection structure for conductive blades comprising a conductive blade (#6) and a fastening section (#1) extended from the surface of the conductive blade for holding a silver contacts (page 1, line 9) the fastening section having a hole (#2) extending through the conductive blade, the fastening section having at least one wall (#3) extending from the top surface (top of #3) to the bottom surface (#1 top surface of base) thereof with the at least one wall having at most one angle (#4) but otherwise being straight in a longitudinal direction such that the fastening section linearly extends through the conductive blade except for the one angle.

With respect to Claim 8, Taylor further teaches that the at least one wall of the fastening section is a single, continuous wall which extends linearly through the conductive blade (see Fig. 3).

With respect to Claims 9 and 13, Taylor further teaches that the wall of the fastening section has a circular shape (see Fig. 3).

With respect to Claim 10, Taylor further teaches that a bottom surface of the conductive blade forms a right angle (#4 and page 3, lines 17-19) with the at least one wall of the fastening section (see Fig. 3).

With respect to Claim 11, Taylor further teaches that a striking zone (#9) is provided at a top (#3 top) of the fastening section on the conductive blade, the at least one wall of the fastening section forms a right angle (see Fig. 3) with the striking zone.

With respect to Claim 12, Taylor further teaches that the at least one wall of the fastening section is a single, continuously smooth wall (see Fig. 3).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5 and 16, as best understood by examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (GB 2,257,832 A) in view of Frank et al. (US 2,854,074).

With respect to Claims 1-2, Taylor teaches a silver contact connection structure for conductive blades comprising a conductive blade (#1) and a fastening section (#3) extended from the surface of the conductive blades for holding a silver contact (#6), the fastening section having a hole (#2) extending through both sides with a fastening section matching a shape of a mold (#7) used with the silver contact connection structure. Taylor fails to disclose a horizontal cross section of the fastening section having a saw shape. Frank et al. teach a horizontal cross section (see Fig. 1B) of the fastening section having a non-circular saw shape (#2b).

With regard to Claims 3-5, it is noted that “the determination of patentability is based on the product itself, not on its method of production. While Taylor in view of Takano fails to teach the method of manufacture by machining, it would have been obvious to use any known method to achieve the same end product. If the product in

the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. MPEP 2113.

With respect to Claim 16, Taylor teaches the claimed invention, but fails to disclose that the at least one wall of the fastening section has a saw shape. Frank et al. teaches the at least one wall of the fastening section has a saw shape (see Fig. 1B).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the structure of Taylor with the saw shape of Frank et al. to provide more intimate contact between the fastening section and the conductive blade.

8. Claim 6, as best understood by examiner, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (GB 2,257,832 A) in view of Frank et al. (US 2,854,074) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Takano (US 4,259,557).

With respect to Claim 6, Taylor in view of Frank et al. teach the silver contact connection structure of the above claims, but fail to disclose that the fastening section has a bucking end with a chamfered angle. Takano teaches the fastening section (Fig. 21, #5) has a bucking end (Fig. 21, #4b) on one end thereof formed in a chamfered angle (Fig. 21, #7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the connection structure of Takano for the purpose of providing a chamfer in the fastening section to hold the silver contact in a fixed position in relationship to the fastening section.

9. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (GB 2,257,832 A) in view of Takano (US 4,259,557).

With respect to Claim 14, Taylor teaches the claimed invention of claim 7 above and at the at least one wall of the fastening section is a single, continuous wall (see Fig. 3) with a bucking end at one end thereof forming a radius (#4) such that the wall of the fastening section linearly extends through the conductive blade except at the bucking end. Taylor fails to teach the chamfered angle on the bucking end of wall. Takano teaches a chamfered angle (#7) such that the hole (#6) of the fastening section (#5) linearly extends (see Fig. 4) through the conductive blade except at the bucking end. With respect to Claim 15, Takano further teaches that the fastening section has a bucking end (#4b) at one end thereof forming a chamfered angle (#7) such that the at most one angle (see Fig. 4) is formed by the bucking end.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the structure of Taylor with the chamfered angle of Takano for the purpose of restraining the silver contact from upward movement.

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fusegawa et al. (JP 09-260007) teaches a fastening section extending from the top surface of the conductive blade having a wall having at most one angle.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert J. Hoffberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-2761. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 4:30 PM Mon - Fri.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RJH

**BORIS CHERVINSKY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

  
7/5/6